



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2025

by Mr T Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/25/3365944

26a Deerfield Close, Buckingham, MK18 7ET

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr A Humberstone against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
 - The application Ref is 25/00327/APP.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the existing house and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this 2 storey house which is at the end of a terrace of 4 similar properties. The appeal site sits within a residential area which consists of a mix of terraced and semi-detached 2 storey houses. The buildings appear to date from broadly the same era but display some variations in design and detailing.
4. No 26a and the remainder of the terrace is set back from the road behind a green area and has a footpath across its front. A car parking area to the side provides for vehicle access to this and other properties. The terrace has a slightly staggered appearance as No26a and its immediate neighbour are set forward with the appeal property being set forwardmost. No 26a has a narrow frontage to its plot which widens to the rear to provide a plot which is wider than the others in the terrace.
5. The proposal seeks permission to construct a 2 storey side and rear extension. The side extensions would have its front elevation flush with the existing front elevation and the gabled roof over would be a continuation of the existing roof. The rear element of the extension would span the entire width of the existing site and would have a hipped roof with a ridge at the same height as the existing ridge.
6. Notwithstanding the fact that the property is set behind the grassed area, I consider that the proposed extension would be readily visible from other areas. Not only from the road but also from the front of the neighbouring properties and from the adjacent car parking area.

7. The Council refers to Policy BE2 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (2021) (LP) and principles DES58 and DES60 of the Vale of Aylesbury Design Supplementary Planning Document (2023) (SPD). Policy BE2 states that all new development proposals shall respect and complement i) the physical characteristics of the site and its surroundings including the scale and context of the site and its setting, ii) the local distinctiveness and vernacular character of the locality, in terms of ordering, form, proportions, architectural detailing and materials, iii) the natural qualities and features of the area, and iv) the effect on important public views and skylines. It adds that more guidance on the detail for the application and implementation of this policy will be provided in the Aylesbury Vale Design SPD. Principle DES58 of the SPD states that extensions should be subservient to the scale, form and massing of the original dwelling. Principle DES60 states that side extensions should be subservient to the original dwelling and normally be set back from the front of the house to retain the proportions of the original building and reduce the visual impact of the join between existing and new.
8. Whilst I appreciate that the SPD offers guidance and may not be applicable to every single case, it seems to me that it offers relevant guidance in the design and judgement of extensions. The appeal proposal would appear not to adhere to the guidance offered in the SPD. The front section contains no set-back, the new roof would appear as a continuation of the existing roof and the extension could be considered as a 'wrap-around' style which the SPD warns against.
9. In my judgement, the continuation of the front elevation and roof, as proposed on a house which is set forward of the others in the terrace, would mean that the extension would appear prominent and not subservient. It would extend up to the side plot boundary and fill this wider-than-normal plot. The side extension would extend deeper than the existing house and the 2 storey rear element would fill the width of the plot. When seen from the front and the side, I consider that this would mean that the proposed extension would manifestly fail to appear subservient to the original house. It would appear overbearing and would overwhelm the relatively modest original house. In this way it would appear harmful to the surrounding area.
10. The appellant has referred to a number of other properties in the area that have had extensions to them and which, the appellant indicates, would have been judged using guidance very similar to (or the same as) the existing SPD. Nos 9 and 11 Badgers Way are detached houses and the nature of the context is different to the appeal scheme and I do not see these as directly relevant. The permitted extension to No 10 Deerfield Close relates to one of a pair of semi-detached houses, wherein the design of each individual is different to its attached neighbour and so significant breaks in the roofline exist. I also note that the first floor, as approved, is set in from the side plot boundary. Again, these matters mean that the extension at No 10 is of limited relevance to the appeal. The extension at No 19 Swallow Close is more modest than the appeal scheme and, although it extends towards the parking area adjacent to it, its effects are far less.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I consider that the proposed extension would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the original house and its surroundings, contrary to Policy BE2 of the LP. As a consequence, the appeal is dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR